

SENATOR DWORAK: Thank you. Senator Goodrich is indicating that the minimum this could cost is \$125,000 a year. But when we start tampering with retirement benefits, these are expressed obligations down the future. What it's costing to change these benefits, and what it will cost the taxpayers of the State of Nebraska for this one agency down the road is \$4,250,000 at the maximum, or \$1,856,000, or almost \$2 million at the minimum. I think I can probably justify a cost of living increase for those retired Patrolmen because we know, as Senator Hasebroock pointed out, of the inflationary spiral. But that is significant fiscal impact on this, I think, is on the lowering retirement age. If we had serious problems in turnover, which I do not think we have as indicated by the new Patrolmen that are hired, I'd say maybe we should look into lowering this retirement age. But without these serious problems I very seriously question the need to lower the retirement age. I think we better take a look at the total retirement system. We do one thing for one agency, then other agencies want the same thing. I'm not so sure they shouldn't get it. I'm not so sure we should be showing this preferential treatment. We talk about this state not going into debt, but with a retirement program that is just exactly what we're doing, we're going into debt. These benefits have to be paid. We're obligating the people of Nebraska down the road, there is just no question about it. We're increasing that obligation with this bill by \$4,250,000. Out of that \$4,250,000 almost 50 percent of it comes from lowering the retirement age from 55 to 51. I don't see it as that significant of a benefit that might be useful in recruiting new Patrolmen, while it certainly is a very costly benefit. I would like to see us.... I'd like to ask Senator Warner a question. I see he voted against this particular measure. I'd like to hear his reasons on why he voted against it.

PRESIDENT: You have one minute.

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Dworak, I guess my concern at the time, there was two things, one, the committee took out some of the impact, that helped. But I did have a concern about the reduction in the retirement age. That was essentially why I voted no. There is other parts of the bill that deal with widows and children of officers that I think is important. My reason for no was concern on the reduction in the retirement age that would be possible.

SENATOR DWORAK: Thank you Senator Warner. I wonder if it would be possible to put an amendment on this bill....

PRESIDENT: Thank you Senator. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, I would like to ask Senator Warner a question relative to the problem that Senator Dworak raised in regard to turnover at the Patrol. Senator Warner, are you aware of the turnover rate in the Patrol, and is it excessive? If so, do you believe that it is connected with the retirement benefits, or salary, or could it be with something else?

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Schmit, we have had figures on turnover. I don't recall them off the top of my head. I could get them. We have had that compiled, and I don't remember it exactly. I better go get a copy of it I guess.